U.S. Department of Education
2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) [] Charter [] Title I [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal: Mr. James Glynn

Official School Name: Cold Spring Elementary School

School Mailing Address:
358 Homan Road
Stanfordville, NY 12581-6036

County: Dutchess State School Code Number*: 131301040003

Telephone: (845) 868-7451 Fax: (845) 868-1105

Web site/URL: www.ppcsd.org E-mail: j.glynn@ppcsd.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Ms. Linda Kaumeyer

District Name: Pine Plains CSD Tel: (518) 398-7181

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Helene McQuade

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*
The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2004.

6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.

7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: (per district designation)

2	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
1	Middle/Junior high schools
1	High schools
	K-12 schools
4	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 17596

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

[ ] Urban or large central city
[ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
[ ] Suburban
[ ] Small city or town in a rural area
[X] Rural

4. 9 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK			0	**6**			0
K	12	17	29	**7**			0
1	15	3	18	**8**			0
2	11	22	33	**9**			0
3	10	13	23	**10**			0
4	18	17	35	**11**			0
5	16	24	40	**12**			0
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					178

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

1 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
0 %	Asian
4 %	Black or African American
6 %	Hispanic or Latino
0 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
87 %	White
2 %	Two or more races
100 %	**Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 6 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	6
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	5
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	11
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	178
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.062
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	6.180

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 1 %

Total number limited English proficient 1

Number of languages represented: 1

Specify languages:

Spanish.

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 17 %

Total number students who qualify: 31

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 3 %

Total Number of Students Served: 6

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

____	Autism	____	Orthopedic Impairment
____	Deafness	____	Other Health Impaired
____	Deaf-Blindness	6	Specific Learning Disability
____	Emotional Disturbance	____	Speech or Language Impairment
____	Hearing Impairment	____	Traumatic Brain Injury
____	Mental Retardation	____	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
____	Multiple Disabilities	____	Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	
Classroom teachers	10	
Special resource teachers/specialists	2	2
Paraprofessionals	1	1
Support staff	0	2
Total number	14	5

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 **10 :1**

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	95%	94%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	96%	98%	96%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	0%	5%	12%	18%	6%
Student dropout rate	%	%	%	%	%

Please provide all explanations below.

- **Daily Student Attendance 05-06:** One percentage point below expectancy. With a small school population, only a few more/less student absences results in relatively large increase/decrease in percentage points. Attendance Goals *were* more proactively addressed by the school in 2006-7 through current school year.

- **Teacher Turnover Rates:** Are relatively high in school years 06-07 and 05-06 due to a number of retirements in addition to small number of total faculty. (Example: 3 retirements among 16 faculty results in an 18.75% turnover rate.) Although they may be considered as turnovers, retirements are not considered as a "negative reason for leaving."

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size	_____	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____	%
Enrolled in a community college	_____	%
Enrolled in vocational training	_____	%
Found employment	_____	%
Military service	_____	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	_____	%
Unknown	_____	%
Total	_____	%

PART III - SUMMARY

Cold Spring Elementary School (CSES) is a K-5 public school serving approximately 180 children. While our school is located in a bucolic setting, it is less than 2 hours from the largest urban area in the United States. Across the past 6-to-8 school years, there have been noticeable increases in the diversity of students and families we serve in terms of economic status and racial/ethnic backgrounds.

CSES is recognized in the school district, community and beyond as a small school with a positive learning culture evidenced, in part, by strong, positive local and state student achievement/assessment results, as well as a high percentage of families choose this school as the long-term educational environment for all their children, and—in certain cases—grandchildren.

The district's adopted goals or "pillars" are viewed as the larger-scale mission which set a course for all our "local efforts." Vision work, gathering input from students, faculty, staff, parents and community members, has occurred throughout the district for the past two school years. All school committees and grade level/academic decisions are distilled via these overarching priorities.

As for our school's overriding mission, (subcategorized as goals and objectives), since the 2001-02 school year, our building level planning team has consistently involved parent, staff, faculty and administrative members who cooperatively focus on specific efforts to support children's academic and social/emotional achievement. Based on a facilitated process of brainstorming and gathering input from faculty, staff, parent and student constituent groups via formal (survey) and informal (discussion) means, our team hones building goals and objectives to address a few key areas each year. Our plan-of-action document, developed after this input stage, is routinely shared, evaluated and revised, existing as a "living document." Foci for the past several school years have *included*: 1. improving and/or continuing student attendance in order to affect positive achievement, 2. encouraging student preparedness for long-term academic and life success, and 3. using test data to inform instruction in areas of English language arts and mathematics.

Understanding the culture of our school has been uniform emphasis for many year, initiated, in large part, by the principal's doctoral research suggesting that multi-faceted organizational cultural characteristics are present in effective schools. Effectiveness, in this instance, is equated with maintaining and promoting student achievement, measured via multiple year review of the school's state referenced index of Adequate Yearly Progress. (The leadership response—Part V. 6—delves in to this continuous cultural application in more detail.)

Another integrated theme, or milestone, has been that by learning to help others, we learn about, and—ultimately, help—ourselves. Fundraising efforts are not uncommon and are "hands on learning experiences" for students. Children "pitch in" to wrap gifts, count change, and chart funds collected. After a summer of 2008 trip to establish an art camp in the Dominican Republic, the principal presented information to all K-5 students in grade level, in order to compare and contrast our societal and educational cultures with those of the children from another part of the world. Students followed up with classroom discussions and wrote about their reactions to what had been presented.

What has and will continue to inform our decisions within the school relates to the unflagging understanding that each child must be routinely and uniquely supported in his or her aim for excellence. Achievement may be of the academic type, or related to social mindfulness, or—in our educational environment—the best of both.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

Assessment results are reported and described for annual New York State Grades 3 through 5 English Language Arts and mathematics assessments. The New York State Education Department defines performance descriptors as follows: Level 1 - Not Meeting Learning Standards. Level 2 - Partially Meeting Learning Standards. Level 3 -Meeting Learning Standards. Level 4 - Meeting Learning Standards with Distinction. Go to https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-external/2008statewideAOR.pdf for additional information.

Using the data tables as a guide, the following general trends in assessment data are noted and "discussed":

- For the 2008-9 school year, compared to the previous three school years, grades 3 and 5 students scored at their highest levels, meeting or exceeding proficiency, in areas of English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. As of the 2008-09 school year, the state assessments at Grades 3 and 5 had been in place for three previous school years, and students at these grades were—in majority—continually entered in the school. Fifth graders, in particular, were readily familiar with assessment formats, having taken ELA and mathematics assessments as third and fourth graders. Perhaps most importantly, third and fifth classroom grade level teachers, who had not administered state assessments until the 2005-06 school year, were—at this point—more "experienced" with standards based assessments, receiving training related to exposure to assessments models, as well as grade-level standards and performance indicators.

- The 5th grade 2008-09 cohort exhibited "significant ELA gains," evidenced by the percentage of these students at or above proficiency for three school years/grades: Grade 5% - 100, Grade 4% - 88, Grade 3% - 72. Student familiarity with assessment and more focused, or on-point instruction in grades K-5, are believed to have created such quantifiable progress. Longer-term, consistent ELA professional development opportunities had also been provided to teachers, and specific assessment training/"standards work," as well.

- The disparity for the cohort of children scoring as proficient and above level in the area of mathematics as fourth graders in 2005-06, 96, compared to the averaged percentage of 63 as fifth graders in 2006-07 is not easily explained. Although these findings may be an anomaly. mathematics is a curriculum area receiving increased pedagogical attention. As of the 2008-09 school year, the district has focused on auditing mathematics instructional programs by reviewing assessment results, directly observing and diagnosing K-8 mathematics instruction, and closely monitoring teaching and learning expectations.

- Considering the ELA and mathematics results percentages for those students scoring at proficiency and above, (Levels 3 and 4), versus children who performed solely above proficiency, (Level 4), suggests children performing at the advanced levels is not nearly as high, or high enough. The *mean* ELA percentage of students at the proficient and above level for four school years and the three grades is: 84.1, while the averaged percentage of students scoring at the advanced level is 8.7. For the area of reading instruction, our school and district personnel should (and will) continue to work to develop better means to support children in "advancing to the next level." The focus across the past few years has related to Guided Reading training. As of the current school year, our K-2 teachers are piloting a new phonics based instructional model, while keeping other aspects of early literacy development. In grades 3 through 5, student writing instructional methodologies are addressed through grade level and individual classroom consultation support. In mathematics, the averaged percentage of proficient students and above is: 88.6, while the average percentage of advanced scoring students is 22.9. As described elsewhere in this document, mathematics has more recently received increased attetion via an "auditing process."

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

The school's principal also serves as the New York State designated district data administrator. Having such direct access to assessment results, analytical tools and interactions with other data administrators and state and county representatives, he consistently shares results and provides more "in-depth breakdowns" of assessment results to classroom and support teachers, as well as other building and district administrators.

Our district contracts for and receives analyses of ELA, mathematics, science and social studies state assessment results in detailed, graphic/numbers-based ways, (e.g. analysis of each student's responses in graphical and numbers-based formats.) Such findings are shared with, and described for, grade level, special education, and remedial instructors.

The principal routinely develops in-house professional development sessions that allows all teachers, K-5, to be familiar with state standards, key indicators, and established means of curricular assessment. Terminology used to designate student and school performances has been defined, and usefulness of data, in general, has been addressed in terms of what is available and how it may be used. All teachers have been guided through small- and whole-group review and discussion of state assessments, in order for one and all to be familiar with the assessment formats, as well as to develop curriculums and instruction that is standards based.

Local assessments, such as the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills and Measures of Academic Progress, are administered and analyzed multiple times across each school year. Such evaluative measures have been especially chosen since they be used to directly consider each student's expected, in comparison to actual, progress in core academic areas—and may be used to almost immediately, inform/adjust instruction. Classroom and special instructional faculty have received training and further professional development opportunities to most effectively use results to enhance teaching and student learning.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Three years ago, elementary principals and representative, K-5 teachers worked cooperatively across a 10-month period to create an overall grading system and reporting format in a manner more "in line" with our state's standards assessment model. Until such revisions, K, 1st and 2nd, and 3rd through 5th grades school report cards all had separate evaluation methodologies. In certain instances, parents and children needed to learn and understand changing evaluative criteria when transitioning from grade-to-grade. There is now consistency in the elementary leveled evaluation system, in concert with state assessment results. Parents and students are also more routinely provided with in-depth mid-trimester interim reports that allow for additional teacher generated comments about progress, and/or lack thereof, in all areas formally assessed in each trimester report card. Information regarding this revised system was provided to parents by mail, and all K-5 parents continue to be afforded an opportunity to discuss the report card, in terms of format, as well as specific grades a child receives, at the time of fall parent-teacher conferences.

Grades 3 through 5 state assessment results and individual student performance reports are sent to parents with performance descriptors and terminology defined. Parent also receive a cover letter from the principal further explaining local performance on particular tests, mandated services that may be required, and futher resources provided by the NY State Education Department.

Four years ago, new local assessments (acheivement tests) were adopted to better inform teaching and learning processes. Parents had and continue to have an opportunity to discuss each child's performance with classroom teachers and support faculty at the time of mandated parent-teacher conferences. Descriptors of performance results are included and further explained, as necessary.

Question and Answer documents were prepared for both report card/grading revisions and local assessment, and sent to all parents/families.

4. **Sharing Success:**

At the local level, school/committee constituents report out our collective achievements and challenges with other district stakeholders. Members of our various committees serve as active participants on all district-wide committees, charged with creating successful learning environments through improving and maintaining student attendance and study skills, etc.. School constituents, such as the principal, faculty, staff and the PTA make a concerted effort to provide information about our local efforts to the area newspaper, which—in turn—provide information to neighboring school and district leaders, faculties, and communities.

The district's superintendent and assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction attend different consortiums and put other building leaders and teachers in touch with our school's representatives to provide counsel and support regarding our successful programs and service models.

The building principal has attended bi-monthly meetings with other area elementary administrators at which successes and challenges were presented and addressed. The elementary principals within our district communicate several times a week and regularly meet to support our local and combined efforts. Teachers within the district are purposefully provided with numerous professional develop opportunities, in and out of district, so our faculty members may share what's proven effective.

Recognition as a school that has achieved Blue Ribbon status would come with an increased sense of responsibility for all stakeholders. It would appear valuable to "spread the good news," describing what's in place, and what might be adopted by other educational entitities involved in the most important work of providing successful learning opportunities.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

A particular textbook does not "drive curriculum" at Cold Spring Elementary School. Rather, it serves as a resource for instructors and learners. The concept of what a textbook is has been expanded to include leveled fiction and non-fiction books, and other identified, guided reading materials.

Overall, curricular approaches are appropriately eclectic, yet necessarily focused, based on best practices, state standards and performance indicators, or—for the area of mathematics—bands and strands—as well as analyses of local and state student assessment results.

Classroom teachers, the district two elementary principals and (certified) reading specialists engaged in a multiple-day review of *English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum* when state standards were modified to specifically reflect individual grade level expectations. Reading curriculum, as described below, has since received more intensive attention and programmatic revisions. For the past four years we have worked with outside consultants to expand and implement a guided reading model. During the current, 2009-10 school year, 3 through 5 classroom teachers and associated specialists are receiving further consultant support to refine teaching the student writing process, while K-2 teachers are piloting a particular phonics program, based on the Wilson Reading program.

Mathematics curriculum is represented by grade level scopes and sequences, developed with other districts' personnel in a county educational consortium. The order of instruction of key concepts, determining specific grade level mathematics instructional content, and means of student mastery/assessment were developed and are revised, as appropriate. Through this collaborative process, we have culled "essential learnings" to guide math instruction. As a further means to bolster curriculum, a full-scale, grade K-8 mathematics evaluation, including support from outside consultants, began during the 2008-09 school year. A team of district teachers and administrators continue address mathematics instructional and learning needs.

Science curriculum is based primarily on the Science 21 program, developed and updated by a New York State Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) in response to state standards. An "experimental approach" is embedded in this curriculum; the student acts as observer, recorder and interpreter of scientific data. Additionally, science workshops are routinely offered to teachers new to a grade level, or those interested in specific connections between science and other curriculum. Finally, many instructors routinely supplant Science 21 instruction with lessons from other sources, such as the Internet and science texts.

Social studies curriculum has been reviewed by K-5 elementary faculty representatives and school leaders. The state's social studies standards were used to guide the selection of a program. There is a concerted emphasis on more extensive student writing opportunities within the area of social studies instruction, such as the guided development of responses to Document Based Questions. While other schools may tend to reduce science and social studies instruction, to allow for increased blocks of ELA and mathematics instruction, our school's educators have redoubled efforts to integrate coordinated learning activities, highlighting—for example—the aspects of ELA that are inherent in any written science or social student product.

The visual and performing arts instruction, while directly related instruction to each special area standards, also supports core curricula. Art, music, library and physical education specialists have collected monthly input from classroom teachers in an effort to tailor specials' instructional aspects to grade level topics. When third grade addresses specific geographic and cultural regions, for example, our art and music teachers,

librarian, and even the physical education instructor, have had occasion to provide activities that relate to and support understanding another people in another land.

2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading**:
(This question is for elementary schools only)

For the area of English language arts (ELA), educational consultants have been integrally involved at the elementary level since the 2006-2007 school year. Work has occurred with larger groups of teachers to provide a knowledge base, as well as grade level and special area assistance, for the implementation of a *guided reading program*, an approach designed to help *individual* students learn how to process a variety of increasingly challenging texts with understanding and fluency. There is, inherent in this instructional methodology, the instructional requirement to regroup and diversify for instruction. Teching involves supporting individuals, small groups and the whole class, through a process of continuous observation, diagnosis, and necessary re-teaching.

The consultant spent time observing, modeling and developing grade-to-grade reading curriculum (instructional) guides with teachers. Faculty and school administrators participated in workshops and instructional dialogues during in-district conference days, when school (and students) were "in session," and during summer, multiple-day learning institutes. Many of our classroom and reading teachers have also received more in-depth multi-sensory reading training. The number of leveled books has expanded to support the reading curriculum.

The faculty at Cold Spring Elementary School are active participants in determining instructional approaches, though ably supported by "outside experts." An example from some years ago: despite a trainer for a textbook series indicating that *only* whole-group reading instruction was to occur, regrouping for reading instruction was not discontinued at our school, further evidence of the pedagogical integrity and expertise that exists. Because of this continued, eclectic approach, there is a "goodness of fit" between more recently adopted, guided reading means of teaching and learning, as well as phonics and overall literacy instruction.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

Technology curriculum does not exist as a separate entity from other curricula at Cold Spring Elementary School. Integration efforts are key. A particular technological learning program has been introduced at the elementary level, which creates development of cumulative computer literacy through application in curriculum-based learning units.

Since teachers, as much as students vary in terms of their overall technological skills, there have been concerted efforts to expand the knowledge base of both groups to support all curricula.

A team, comprised—in part—of elementary instructors and administrators, meets regularly to parse ways to enhance all teaching and learning opportunities through the application of appropriate technologies. Building and district administration have dramatically increased active dialogues between faculty, administration and technologists from within and outside the district. More long-term "model schools technological support" is now afforded to the two elementary schools, with a technology facilitator visiting classrooms and our computer labs to directly assist faculty and administration. Faculty within the district who are especially technologically adept are encouraged to support other teachers. Faculty meetings have been devoted to an instructors demonstrating the use of technology to effectively deliver instruction, and—subsequently—these teachers spent time in others' classrooms, expanding the overall use of technology to support instruction and learning for adults and children.

Our school's K-2 writing lab includes a number of Linux-based computers, allowing children to avail themselves of programs to support their ELA skill attainment. Students in this setting work generally work in

a whole group to learn, practice and review new literacy skills, and then access computes/technology to individually further their reading and writing abilities.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

Core curricula are routinely differentiated for all students at our school. A description of kindergarten differentiation follows, to highlight individuated teaching and learning experiences in a grade in which such efforts may tend to be less common.

Kindergarten children are re-grouped for instructional based on learning opportunities that involve reading readiness, mathematics, and beginning writing activities. These kindergarten small group, "table activities" occur for approximately 60-to-75-minutes each morning. Classroom teachers create flexible groups, depending upon the academic task at hand. Each (part-time) classroom assistant provides direct and indirect support for the instructor and children, and a speech/language therapist has had occasion to "push in," working in the classroom with students with speech and language needs. Daily, small-group Academic Intervention Services (AIS) are delivered, primarily in the area of ELA. Student progress is reviewed at least once a year by a Primary Instructional Support team, comprised of classroom and AIS teachers, the principal and the support staff such as the nurse, school psychologist and speech/language therapist. Children's learning, health and social/emotional needs and relative strengths are discussed, and instruction and subsequent supports are adjusted, accordingly.

At points during the past four-to-six school year, children with strong skills in a specific area or areas are provided with appropriate academic challenges. The classroom teacher has consulted with upper grade level teachers to design individual learning opportunities, and—although less common—children have spent instructional time in a higher grade classroom to benefit from more advanced instruction. Kindergarten teachers also engage those students in the classroom who are "developmentally ready" to "stretch their learning" by journal writing, reading to other children and adults in the school, etc.

5. **Professional Development:**

As of approximately six years ago, primarily related to changes in upper-level, district administration, professional development opportunities expanded exponentially. Although there now exists the potential for much more professional development in the school, within the district and/or via outside workshops, training requests must be "tied to" to district goals. This approach provides necessary structure, allowing for focused yet unique pedagogical experiences.

The district has also greatly increased in-house professional development offerings. As previously described, English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics instructional areas have received intensive supports. Outside trainers or facilitators spend time in elementary classrooms, working with grade level teams, whole-groups and individual teachers to better develop viable teaching and learning methodologies. Guided reading, student writing and phonics instruction have been the ELA areas particularly emphasized. The K-8 mathematics audit, also previously discussed, will continue to better determine effective professional development, while involvement in an eight-year mathematics scope and sequence work at a county level has given K-5 teachers the ability to further develop best practices.

Additionally, there are concerted efforts to provide mini-professional development trainings sessions at the school level. The principal, for example, has structured and delivered workshops addressing the use of assessment data to inform instruction. At faculty meetings, small and whole-group activities regular occur related to professional topics such as use of effective praise, and further developing classroom community approaches.

After workshop or conference occurs the principal cooperatively works with other constituents to evaluate trainings, as well as to tailor further professional development needs, based on faculty input.

6. **School Leadership:**

Throughout his tenure, the building leader has actively focused on assessing the school's organizational culture in order to maintain and/or create programs, services, and associated supports to benefit the learners and the learning environment.

As a facilitator of a school based planning team, the principal works with other constituents to actively link culture to student achievement. A cultural assessment instrument—The OCAI (Cameron and Quinn, 1999)—has been administered to school faculty, and results were interpreted and applied to support what we do well and what we might do even better. Faculty evaluated the current culture of our school culture, as well as how they (each) wished it to be, (an ideal culture). Without a significant difference between the two averaged ratings, there was evidence of some sense of an effectiveness of school culture, and our leadership team then worked to further support the continued presence of our school's varied and positive cultural traits.

The principal has encouraged and promoted distributive leadership to tap into each member's abilities and talents. Building committees are chaired or co-chaired by teachers, staff and/or parents. The school leader, then, serves to buttress rather than direct communication between constituents. It is, perhaps, because of our collective efforts, that our Building Level Planning Team, Building Safety Team, and Character Education Committee are viewed as district models. Faculty meetings are established with input from the teachers, and are often active discussion or learning/sharing opportunities.

Human capital is viewed as an invaluable resource. Parents are actively involved in all building based committees, and students have been included in listening sessions, to provide input as to "realistic, kid-tested methods" of developing programs and solutions to challenges. Shared Leadership that is has obvious and apparent synergistic benefits for the school and the children served.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: NYS Math Asess

Edition/Publication Year: not applicable Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	97	92	90	
% Advanced	32	31	28	14	
Number of students tested	34	39	25	25	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		31			
Number of students tested		11			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Grades 3 NYS mathematics assessment was not administered in New York State in 2004-5 or before.
Economically disadvantaged and other subgroup information is not yet available for 2008-9 school year, since NY State School Report Card information has not yet been released.

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: NYS ELA Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Not Applicable Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	77	72	70	
% Advanced	12	18	4	3	
Number of students tested	33	39	25	30	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		73			
% Advanced		9			
Number of students tested		11			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Note NYS ELA assessment not administered to Grade 3 students until 2005-6 school year.

Economically disadvantaged and other subgroup information is not yet available for the 2008-9 school year, since State School Report Cards have not yet been released.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: NYS Mathematics Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Not Applicable Publisher: McGraw-Hill/NYS

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	96	73	96	
% Advanced	22	33	27	28	
Number of students tested	41	24	30	25	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
No subgroup has 10 or more students in it for any school year.

Grade 4 Mathematics Assessment changed as of the 2005-6 school year, not allowing for comparison with earlier, 2004-5 results.

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: NYS ELA

Edition/Publication Year: Not applicable Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	88	79	84	
% Advanced	5	4	10	4	
Number of students tested	40	25	29	25	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Economically disadvantaged and other subgroup information is not yet available since NYS School Report Cards have not yet been released.

A different version of the Grade 4 ELA was administered in 2004-5 school year, not allowing for direct, year-to-year comparisons.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: NYS Mathematics Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Not Applicable Publisher: McGraw-Hill/NYS

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	93	63	78	
% Advanced	18	23	0	8	
Number of students tested	28	30	27	37	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Note Grade 5 Mathematics Assessment was not administered in NYS until 2005-06 school year.

Student subgroups do not contain 10 or more students.

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: NYS ELA

Edition/Publication Year: Not Applicable Publisher: McGraw-Hill/NYS

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	87	92	84	
% Advanced	18	3	12	11	
Number of students tested	28	30	26	37	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Grade 5 NYS ELA assessments did not begin until the 2005-06 school year.